

Not only is this newly claimed feature not taught by Fields, but there is no teaching in any of the prior art of record to suggest providing Fields with this feature.

In view of these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 as anticipated by Fields appears in order and is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 5, and 7-33 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The examiner has held that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicant takes issue with the type of output signal produced by the inverter device. Fields discloses an inverter device that produces an output signal that is substantially dark (Col 2 rows 53-55) when an optical input beam is present. When an optical input beam is not present, a predetermined intensity level output beam is provided (Col 2 rows 58-59). The combiner (Fields fig. 2: 30) in the inverter device creates an interference pattern that is destructive and the output beam is zero or dark. The combiner (30) does not produce a continuous wave coherent phase modulated output signal.


The applicant's device provides an output signal that is phase modulated. As described in the Summary the device produces "two possible output signals of equal magnitude and opposite phase". As shown in Tables 1 and 2 and on page 4 lines 7-8, "when the pulsed input signal 3 is ON, the output signal is $I\sin(x + 0^\circ)$, and when the pulsed input signal 3 is OFF, the output signal 4 is an inverted signal of $I\sin(x + 180^\circ)$ which is equal to $-I\sin(x + 0^\circ)$ ". The output signal is a binary phase shift keying (BPSK) signal. Fields does not teach an inverter device that provides phase modulated output signals. The phase of the output signal is not controlled in Field's device.

In view of the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 are not anticipated by Fields and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is requested.

Claims 3, 5, and 7-33 depend on claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 and for the reasons argued above, with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, and 6, withdrawal of the objection of claims 3, 5, and 7-33 is requested.

In view of the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 1-33 are allowable and the applicant respectfully requests an early notice to such effect.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Charles Romaniuk".

Charles Romaniuk